

SPEAKER NICHOL: That is correct.

SENATOR HIGGINS: I don't know as bracketing it would do any differently. It would be maybe putting off something that we should handle today. I don't think the time between now and January 20th we're going to see that much change in the economy in Nebraska. So I think...I can understand Senator Hefner's motion but at the same time I think we ought to deal with this issue now and not bracket it because it is just postponing something that needs to be done. As I said before, I'm not against the salary increase, it is the percentage that we're going to arrive at. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Haberman, then Senator Warner, then Senator Wesely and Senator DeCamp. Okay, Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, I support the bracket motion. I might as well tell you now if the bracket motion fails, I have a kill on the bill. To answer Senator Higgins, the Governor's increase at 50 percent the first year, the Attorney General at 32.9, Secretary of State 36 percent, same way with the Auditor and the Lieutenant Governor, that's in one year. The fiscal note at the end of this is \$248,593.. Now I don't care what other states do, but I haven't had any of these officers come to me and complain about their salaries. However, when we were snookered on the judges salaries they did come and talk and lobby. And remember, we were snookered on that because we said we will raise the Chief Justice's salary and then all the rest of them will fall into place, 98 percent, 89 percent, so on and so forth. So that was taken away from us. And another thing I object to is the five years. We are tying something down for five years. I don't think that's right. I absolutely don't think that's right. Let's do it in the other fields if we're going to tie this down for five years. Now we've talked about the condition of the farmers and the small businessmen and that's true. I don't think this should pass this year. I think the bracket is a good motion. As I say, if it fails I've got an IPP, but they have the same choice as everybody else. They don't have to run for the office. There is nothing limiting them except the Attorney General from doing something else if they want to if they have to raise some extra funds. So I'm just entirely opposed, first to the idea of five years tying ourselves to it, having a 50 percent and a 32 percent increase from '86 to '87 and I think it's wrong. On one